

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph. The Examiner has also rejected claims 36 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). New claims 45 through 56 have been added to the current application. In view of the following remarks and the above amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending rejections.

The Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph. As the Examiner has suggested, the dependency of rejected claim 41 has been amended to 39. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph should be withdrawn.

The Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 36, 38, 39, 41, 42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bollman and Applicant's admitted prior art as shown in FIG 1. In addition, the Examiner has also rejected claims 37, 40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bollman and Applicant's admitted prior art as shown in FIG 1 and further in view of Godhalk et al.

Newly amended independent claim 36 now explicitly recites "a variable length encoder unit ... for variably compressing the approximated color image data to generate further approximated color image data before transmitting the further approximated color image data; a variable length decoder unit ... for variably decompressing the further approximated color image data back to the approximated color image data so that each pixel is represented by the m bits." Similarly, newly amended independent claim 39 now explicitly recites "variably compressing the approximated color image data to generate further approximated color image data before transmitting the further approximated color image data; transmitting the further approximated

color image data from a first location to a second location; receiving the further approximated color image data at the second location; variably decompressing the further approximated color image data back to the approximated color image data so that each pixel is represented by the m bits.” Lastly, newly amended independent claim 42 now explicitly recites “a transmission side including; ... a variable length encoder unit ... for variably compressing the approximated color image data to generate further approximated color image data before transmitting the further approximated color image data; and a reception side operationally connected to said transmission side including; a variable length decoder unit for variably decompressing the further approximated color image data back to the approximated color image data so that each pixel is represented by the m bits....”

The Bollman et al. reference discloses a method of and a system for approximating the RGB color representation by the luminance/chrominance values, modifying the approximated luminance/chrominance color representation values, and converting the modified approximated luminance/chrominance values back to the RGB color representation. The Bollman et al. reference discloses only color modification to the approximated color representation values and suggests only the variation of color modifications.

The Examiner has conceded that the Bollman et al. reference fails to teach, disclose or suggest a combination of image processing, intensity correction and color correction to process the approximated data. For this lack of the disclosure, the Examiner has pointed out the Applicant’s admitted prior art in Figure 1.

As quoted above, the newly amended independent apparatus and system claims now explicitly recite “a variable length encoder unit” and “a variable length decoder unit.” Similarly, the newly amended independent method claim now explicitly recites the steps of “variably compressing the approximated color image data ...; transmitting the further approximated color image data from a first location to a second location; receiving the further approximated color image data at the second location; variably decompressing the further approximated color image

data ....” In essence, at least the subject matter limitations of now cancelled dependent claims 37, 40 and 43 have been respectively incorporated into newly amended independent claims 36, 39 and 42.

The Examiner has rejected 37, 40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bollman and Applicant’s admitted prior art as shown in FIG 1 and further in view of Godhalk et al. As the Examiner has pointed out that the Godhalk et al. reference discloses a pair of a data compressor and a data decompressor. However, the Godhalk et al. reference does not disclose, teach or suggest “variably compressing the approximated color image data to generate further approximated color image data” and “variably decompressing the further approximated color image data back to the approximated color image data.” By the same token, neither the Bollman et al. reference nor Applicant’s admitted prior art discloses, teaches or suggests the same patentable features. In other words, there is no suggestion to combine the two cited references.

The two cited references, the Bollman et al. reference and the Godhalk et al. reference are in a relevant technological fields, but lack any specific suggestion or motivation to combine the disclosures of the two references. The current invention is directed to a apparatus, system and method of data compression of the already approximated image color data and data decompression of the processed approximated image color data. These patentable features as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 36, 39 and 42 are not even remotely addressed by any combination of the cited references.

Furthermore, newly added independent claims 39 and 42 explicitly recite the transmission from one site to another site. These patentable features are also not even remotely addressed by any combination of the cited references. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the patentable features of newly amended independent claims 36, 39 and 42 based upon the cited references alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 38, 41 and 44 through 56 ultimately depend from newly amended independent claims 36, 39 or 42 and incorporate the above discussed patentable features of the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 36, 39 and 42.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

The Newly Added Claims

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow the newly added claims. The newly added claims are supported by the original disclosures of the current application, and no new matter has been introduced to the current application. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner that newly added claims 45 through 56 should be entered and allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

/KEN I. YOSHIDA/

Date: May 7, 2007

Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.  
Reg. No. 37,009

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC  
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350  
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 599-0600  
Facsimile: (215) 599-0601